Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/652,670	WOLFE, MARK A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael K. Botts	2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _8/29/03, 12/8/03, 12/11/03, and 6/26/05_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _22-32_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _22-32_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _8/29/2003_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _12/5 and 12/6/03_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This document is the first Office Action on the merits. This action is responsive

to the following communications:

a) a continuation application, filed August 29, 2003, which is a continuation of

then co-pending application 09/784,469, filed February 16, 2001, and abandoned

November 13, 2003, which is a continuation of application 09/245,183, filed February 5,

1999, and now U.S. Patent No. 6,263,351, which is a continuation of application

09/014,669, filed January 28, 1998, and now U.S. Patent 5,870,770, which is a

continuation of application 08/487,925, filed June 7, 1995, and abandoned January 29,

1998;

b) a preliminary amendment, filed August 29, 2003, which cancelled claims 1-16,

and submitted new claims 17-21;

c) a First Information Disclosure, filed December 9, 2003;

d) a Second Information Disclosure, filed December 11, 2003; and

e) a second preliminary amendment, filed June 26, 2005, which cancelled claims

17-21, submitted claims 22-32, updated the cross reference to related applications, and

amended the title to now read "EFFICIENTLY DISPLAYING AND RESEARCHING

INFORMATION ABOUT THE INTERRELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN DOCUMENTS."

2.   References DJ, DK and DW, which were identified in the First Information

Disclosure are not found and must be provided.

3. Claims 22-32 have been examined, with claims 22, 26, and 29 being the independent claims.

4. Claims 22-32 are rejected.

The Information Disclosure Statement

5. The information disclosure statement filed December 9, 2003, fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein, which has not been provided, has not been considered. Documents not provided are identified in the information disclosure statement as references DJ, DK, and DW. Legible copies of these documents must be provided in order to be considered.

The Specification

6. Applicant is required to update the status (pending, allowed, etc.) of all parent priority applications in the first line of the specification. The status of all citations of U.S. filed applications in the specification should also be updated where appropriate.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

7.   Claims 22-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bennett, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,444,615) filed June 7, 1993 [hereinafter "Bennett"]).

Regarding **independent claim 22**, Bennett teaches:

> *A method of displaying information on a display screen for a user operating a computer, the method comprising the acts of:*
>
> *displaying a document viewing window on the display screen, wherein the document viewing window includes within it a primary area for viewing documents, and a secondary area, wherein the primary area and the secondary area are integrated into the document viewing window so that the information in the primary area and the secondary area can be seen simultaneously;*

(See, Bennett, Figures 6a-9, and col. 19, lines 49-55: "Specifically, FIG. 6a is detailed perspective view of an attorney terminal which graphically displays specific groupings of

case law information under certain subcategories of the outline library. In a graphical

display mode, the attorney terminal screen is sectioned into three areas: 1) the

command line 33; 2) a graphical display window 253; and 3) a stack window 254.")

> *displaying a first document in the primary area within the document*
>
> *viewing window;*

(See, Bennett, Figure 7c, with the primary area being the "stack window" containing

document beginning: "DQ1: Was any . . ..")

> *upon displaying the first document in the primary area within the document*
>
> *viewing window, automatically displaying, without requiring further input from the*
>
> *user, a link to a second document, wherein the link to the second document is*
>
> *displayed in the secondary area within the document viewing window, wherein*
>
> *the first document in the primary are and the link to the second document in the*
>
> *secondary area are displayed simultaneously in the document viewing window,*
>
> *and wherein the link to the second document is not part of or embedded within*
>
> *the first document, but wherein text included within the second document refers*
>
> *to the first document;*

(See, Bennett, Figure 4c, and col. 19, lines 3-16, noting the automatic display of the

"stack of all associated data items pointed to.")

> *monitoring the selection of the link to the second document; and*
>
> *detecting that the user has selected the link to the second document; and*
>
> *upon detecting that the user has selected the link to the second document,*
>
> *displaying the second document in the primary area within the document viewing*
>
> *window.*

(See, Bennett, Figure 6a, and col. 20, lines 26-37: "To display the groupings, types of data, or specific items contained by any categorization entry, as with the Roman numeric display, the attorney merely double clicks the mouse 31 on the desired block at either of the levels 255 or 257. Doing so causes that block to be displayed at the upper level 255, while the lower level 257 displays the groupings of data. Double clicking on a specific grouping causes that grouping to move to the upper level 255 while displaying the types of data at the lower level 257. Thereafter, double clicking on a specific type of data causes the stack window 254 to display the data items listed (i.e., pointed to) thereunder.")

Regarding **dependent claim 23**, Bennett teaches:

> *The method of claim 22, further comprising the acts of:*
>
> *displaying a third document in the primary area within the document*
>
> *viewing window;*
>
> *upon displaying the third document in the primary area within the*
>
> *document viewing window, automatically displaying, without requiring further*
>
> *input from the user, a link to a fourth document, wherein the link to the fourth*

document is displayed in the secondary area within the document viewing

window, wherein the third document in the primary area and the link to the fourth

document in the secondary area are displayed simultaneously in the document

viewing window, and wherein the link to the fourth document is not part of or

embedded within the third document, but wherein text included within the fourth

document refers to the third document;

monitoring the selection of the link to the fourth document; and

upon detecting that the user has selected the link to the fourth document,

displaying the fourth document.

(See, Bennett, Figures 5a-9, and col. 20, lines 26-37, quoted above.)

Regarding **dependent claim 24**, Bennett teaches:

The method of claim 23, further comprising the act of:

upon displaying the third document in the primary area within the

document viewing window, automatically displaying, without requiring further

input from the user, a link to a fifth document wherein the link to the fifth

document is displayed in the secondary area within the document viewing

window, wherein the third document in the primary area and the link to the fifth

document in the secondary area are displayed simultaneously in the document

viewing window, and wherein the link to the fifth document is not part of or

embedded within the third document, but wherein text included within the fifth

document refers to the third document.

(See, Bennett, Figures 5a-9, and col. 20, lines 26-37, quoted above.)

Regarding **dependent claim 25**, Bennett teaches:

>The method of claim 24, further comprising the act of:

>upon detecting that the user has selected the link to the fourth document,

>continuing to display the link to the fourth document.

(See, Bennett, Figures 6a and 6b, showing changed linked documents in the "stack

window" with the same links in the secondary "graphical display" window.)

Regarding **independent claim 26**, Bennett teaches:

>A method of displaying information on a display screen for a user

>operating a computer, the method comprising the acts of:

>displaying a first document on the display screen;

>displaying a display element on the display screen;

>monitoring the selection of the display element;

>upon detecting that the user has selected the display element, replacing

>the first document on the display screen with a list of links to a plurality of

>documents, wherein none of the plurality of documents is part of or embedded in

>the first document, but wherein text included within each of the plurality of

>documents refers to the first document;

>monitor selection of one of the plurality of links;

>detect that the user has selected a first link, wherein the first link is one of

> *the plurality of links, and wherein the first link is associated with a first linked*
>
> *document; and*
>
> *display the first linked document on the display screen.*

(See, Bennett, Figures 6a-9, and col. 20, line 26 through col. 21, line 11. Specifically,
see Bennett, col. 20, lines 32-37: "Double clicking on a specific grouping causes that
grouping to move to the upper level 255 while displaying the types of data at the lower
level 257. Thereafter, double clicking on a specific type of data causes the stack
window 254 to display the data items listed (i.e., pointed to) thereunder." For "display
elements" see elements at Figure 6a-9, element 263 specifically, and the elements on
levels 255 and 257 generally.)

Regarding **dependent claim 27**, Bennett teaches:

> *The method of claim 26, wherein the act of replacing the first document on*
>
> *the display screen with a list of links to a plurality of documents includes the act*
>
> *of:*
>
> *replacing the first document on the display screen with a list of links to a*
>
> *plurality of documents that are filtered by a characteristic of the documents.*

(See, Bennett, col. 21, lines 12-22, teaching "pre-selection settings" and "selective
pertinence markings" for "selective display of the tailored outline" and that "can be used
individually or in combination for limiting searching." In addition, Bennett teaches that a
certain document may be manually associated with another document. See, Bennett,
col. 20, line 62 through col. 21, line 7.)

Regarding **dependent claim 28**, Bennett teaches:

> The method of claim 26, wherein the act of replacing the first document on the display screen with a list of links to a plurality of documents includes the act of:

> replacing the first document on the display screen with a list of links to a plurality of documents that are sorted by a characteristic of the documents.

(See, Bennett, Figure 6a, and col. 20, lines 54-68, teaching the selection of document types to display as links and flexibility in the display of those links.)

Regarding **independent claim 29**, Bennett teaches:

> A method of displaying information on a display screen for a user operating a computer, the method comprising the acts of:

> displaying a document viewing window on the display screen, wherein the document viewing window includes within it a primary area for viewing documents, and a secondary area, wherein the primary area and the secondary area are integrated into the document viewing window so that the information in the primary area and the secondary area can be seen simultaneously;

> displaying a first document in the primary area within the document viewing window, wherein the first document is referenced by text included in a second document;

> detecting that the user wishes to display a third document;

displaying the third document in the primary area within the document

viewing window;

while displaying the third document, automatically displaying, without

requiring further input from the user, a link to the second document wherein the

link to the second document is displayed in the secondary area within the

document viewing window, wherein the third document in the primary area and

the link to the second document in the secondary area are displayed

simultaneously in the document viewing window, and wherein the link to the

second document is not part of or embedded within the third document;

detecting that the user has selected the link to the second document;

upon detecting that the user has selected the link to the second document,

displaying the second document.

(See, Bennett, Figures 6a-9, and col. 19, line 49 through col. col. 21, line 4, teaching

that documents and links to documents may be displayed in different windows, with the

links being persistent in a secondary window while the documents are fetched from

nodes at various hierarchical levels. Claim 29 reads on permissible flexibility of the

display taught in Bennett. Specifically, see Bennett, col. 20, lines 63-68: "Any of the

entries in the stack window 254 can be selected, via a double click of the mouse 31, for

full display in the edit window illustrated in FIG. 6b. As shown, he edit window 269

overlaps the stack window 254, but night instead overlap the graphical window 253 or

both, pending on the circumstances, to provide for the display of other information.")

Regarding **dependent claim 30**, Bennett teaches:

> The method of claim 29, further comprising the act of:
>
> displaying the second document in the primary area of the document
>
> viewing window.

(See, Bennett, Figures 6a-9, noting the display of linked data in the secondary windows

with the display of the link in the primary viewing area.)

Regarding **dependent claim 31**, Bennett teaches:

> The method of claim 30, wherein the second document and the third
>
> document are related to each other by both including information about a
>
> common subject.

(See, Bennett, Figure 7d, noting deposition question quoted in primary viewing area

with related questions and answers in the secondary viewing area, which documents

are taught by Bennett to be related to the common subject as an example of a legal

matter.)

Regarding **dependent claim 32**, Bennett teaches:

> The method of claim 31, wherein the first document is a judicial opinion.

(See, Bennett, generally and specifically Figure 6a, element 257, identifying a link to a

judicial opinion, "Wine Railway Appliance Co. . . .." Bennett teaches that links and

displays of information may be displayed in easily changeable primary and secondary

windows. Further, Bennett teaches that documents and links to documents may easily be placed in what would be primary and secondary or tertiary and quaternary relationships. It is inherent in the teachings of Bennett that the link in element 257 to the judicial opinion may also be displayed s a primary document area. It would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use Bennett to display a judicial opinion as a second document in a primary viewing area.)

Conclusion

The following prior art is made of record and not relied upon that is considered pertinent to applicants' disclosure:

Wolfe (U.S. Patent 6,263,351) closely related patent by the same inventor, obtained from a parent application.

Wolfe (U.S. Patent 5,870,770) closely related patent by the same inventor, obtained from a parent application.

Rivette, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,623,679) teaching multiple windows and links between widows for patent images and texts.

Parulski, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,414,811) teaching the use of manipulable multiple screens to display data on a database.

Anderson, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,157,783) teaching automatic connection with on-line data bases relevant to document research and teaches links between the research documents. See particularly, Figures 10-18, teaching multiple screen interconnections between documents.

Fujisawa, et al. (U.S. Patent 5,021,989) teaching viewing of multiple document pages on a screen at the same time.

CheckCite™ 3.0, The Definitive Citation Checker, User Manual, by Jurisoft™ Mead Data Central, Inc., 1992, front cover, title page, copyright page, Chapter 2, pages 11-33, Chapter 4, pages 67-81, Appendix A, pages 83-112, Appendix C, pages 127-129, and Appendix D, page 131. This computer program teaches most if not all of the functions claimed in the application, particularly in the Shepard's, LEXCITE, and LEXSEE functions. Examination of the CheckCite program was limited to available user manual documents and the program's interconnectivity between the functions could not be verified.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael K. Botts whose telephone number is 571-272-5533. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday 8:00-4:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MKB

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
10/13/2005